23

24

25

1 (Proceedings commenced at 9:32 a.m., in open court, via 2 teleconference, to wit:) 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: 17-CV-4857, Deslandes v. McDonald's. 4 5 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Alonso. Ι am here in the courtroom, and we are proceeding via 6 7 teleconference this morning. 8 Let's have the attorneys identify themselves. Let's 9 start with the plaintiff's attorneys, then the defense, then 10 the United States, the movant. 11 MS. SHAVER: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Anne 12 Shaver from Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, for the plaintiff. 13 14 MS. BRASS: Good morning, Your Honor. Rachel Brass, 15 from Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, for the defendant. I am joined by my partner, Caeli Higney. 16 MR. ANDALMAN: Your Honor, Robert Andalman, local 17 18 counsel for McDonald's. 19 MR. BOZZO: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Peter 20 Bozzo from the Department of Justice on behalf of the United 21 States. 22 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. 23 We are here on the United States' motion. They are

the movant. It's the United States' motion for leave to file

a statement of interest. As that motion points out, Section

24

25

517 of Title 28 allows the Solicitor General or any officer of the Department of Justice to be sent by the Attorney General to any state or district in the United States to attend to the interests of the United States in a suit pending in a court of the United States, or in a court of a state, or to attend to any other interest of the United States. That is, again, Section 517.

In its motion, the government did not attach a copy of its proposed statement of interest, and the United States does not say in its briefs what its interests are. Obviously, the United States is not a party, and as far as I can see, the case does not touch on political issues or any foreign policy. It appears that the government, more specifically, the executive branch, would like me to have the benefit of its current position with regard to defendant's pending dispositive motion. The government's motion is fully briefed, there has been a response in opposition by the defense, as well as a reply.

I will note that the request seems harmless enough, and while I do appreciate that I cannot have too much information, and I cannot know too much, I will respectfully deny the motion. I am going to do that based upon principles of separation of power. In that regard, I am guided by the US Supreme Court and the Constitution itself. Article III created an independent judiciary and commands that the

independence of the judicial branch be jealously guided. guided by Northern Pipeline Construction Company v. Marathon Pipe Line Company, 458 U.S. 50. It is the Supreme Court from 1982, and, again, guided by the Constitution itself. I will also note that even though it is no bar, I will note the procedural posture that we are in, the age of the case. So while I appreciate the government's interest, and I will note that there is a change in its position, as always, I will rule on the motion based on the facts that are properly before me and principles of stare decisis. So, again, respectfully, the motion is denied. It is number 446. And I will rule on the pending motion electronically.

Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded at 9:36 a.m.)

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, ANNETTE M. MONTALVO, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes and is a full, true and complete transcript of the proceedings.

Dated this 3rd day of March, 2022.

/s/Annette M. Montalvo Annette M. Montalvo, CSR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter